

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement drawing sheets makes changes to Fig. 20 and replaces the original sheet with Fig. 20.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 7, and 8 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiners Chen and Zhen at the interview held November 16, 2006, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

I. Formal Matters

The Office Action objects to the drawings because they do not include reference numeral 1A as recited on pages 33 and 34 of the specification. Fig. 20 is amended to include numeral 1A in order to obviate the objection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

The Office Action objects to the specification because of various informalities. The abstract is amended to define the term "I/F" as "input function." The specification is amended to delete reference numeral 30, and replace "<flow>" with "<Flow>" to obviate the objection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objections to the specification. Applicant gratefully acknowledges that Examiner Chen indicated during the November 16, 2006 interview that he will withdraw the objection to the acronyms WebUI, HTML, and XML because they are terms that are commonly known in the art.

The Office Action objects to claim 8 because of a typographical error. Claim 8 is amended to recite "the acquired plural services" instead of "the plural acquired services" so as to obviate the objection to the claims. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claim 8 be withdrawn.

II. Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cheyer (U.S. Patent No. 6,851,115); and rejects claims 3, 4 and 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Cheyer in view of Bapat (U.S. Patent No. 6,038,563). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Specifically, Applicant asserts that Cheyer and Bapat, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose a cooperation instruction information creation device for creating cooperation instruction information to instruct cooperation of plural services, each performing a specific processing on document data, on a network, including at least a service acquisition unit that acquires plural services available to a user by using user information, wherein the user information includes the present state of the user at the time a service is executed, and is updated each time the service is executed, as recited in independent claim 1 and similarly recited in independent claim 7.

Cheyer, in col. 7, lines 58-63, discloses a user interface that is responsible for accepting user input and sending requests to the facilitator. The facilitator agent then interprets these requests (see Fig. 4, Item 402; Fig. 6, Item 488; col. 6, lines 10-13). Cheyer, however, fails to disclose user information that includes the present state of the user at the time when a service is executed, and is updated each time the service is executed, as recited in claims 1 and 7. Therefore, Cheyer fails to disclose user information, as recited in claims 1 and 7.

Bapat, in col. 3 lines 17-23 and 35-46, merely discloses an access control database that has access control objects that control objects that collectively store information that specifies access rights by users to specified sets of the managed objects. Bapat, however, also fails to disclose user information that includes the present state of the user at the time when a

service is executed, and is updated each time the service is executed, as recited in claims 1 and 7, and therefore fails to make up for the deficiencies of Cheyer.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Cheyer and Bapat, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest user information that includes the present state of the user at the time when a service is executed, and is updated each time the service is executed, as recited in claims 1 and 7.

In accordance with the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7 define patentable subject matter. Claims 2-6 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 8-10 depend from independent claim 7, and therefore, also define patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the examiner withdraw the rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-10 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Stephen P. Catlin
Registration No. 36,101

JAO:EXC/mab

Attachment:

Substitute Abstract
Replacement Drawing Sheet

Date: December 22, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--